

Such light weight paper, although not usable for stand alone paper grocery sacks, still gives shape to the plastic sack, helps the sack stand up on a surface such as in a car, provides an open space in the sack for more easily packing groceries therein, increases the tear resistance of the sack, but minimizes the paper use and, thus, the cost of the paper liner and the combination sack. It provides the advantages of both the plastic sack and the more expensive heavy stand alone paper sack as is currently used.

Page ¹³~~14~~, lines ¹²⁻¹⁴~~2-4~~, state: "the plastic sack provides the support and strength to the lighter weight paper sack to hold it together when filled with groceries . . .". These together clearly indicate that the plastic sack "provides the support and strength" to the lighter weight paper from which the liner is made which lighter weight paper is "not usable for stand alone paper grocery sacks".

This language supports the additional language in the claims. In addition, Page ⁸~~9~~, lines ^{23-26 to page 9, line 1}~~5-10~~ state "and it is an object of this invention to provide a paper liner for a plastic sack to give shape and standing ability to the plastic sack, but not provide a stand alone paper sack intended to carry groceries on its own" and Page ⁷~~10~~, lines ²³⁻²⁵~~7-9~~ state "use paper of 35-lb. to 50-lb, rather than the 57-lb. to 75 lb. paper now used and necessary for stand alone paper grocery sacks" further support such added language. It is submitted that the original language of the specification supports the added language and the added language does not add new matter.

The specification also clearly points out that the lighter paper used is "not strong enough to itself alone hold groceries that would normally fit into the container". The added language indicates, as above, that the "paper container is not strong enough to itself alone hold groceries that would normally fit into the container". This added claim language clearly contemplates that it is not a single light grocery item that might be placed in the sack that the sack cannot hold, but "groceries that would normally fit into the container". The groceries that would normally fit into the container would be a normal load of groceries that would be put into the container and would be expected to be supported by that size of container. This load is something clearly known to a person skilled in the art of loading a grocery sack, a grocery bagger, and would be clearly known to the usual grocery consumer who buys groceries. Normal grocery consumers have a good idea of how much can be placed into a selected size grocery sack. In other words, a sack of light

weight paper may easily hold a single or even several light items or even a single heavy item, but such single or several light items or heavy item or items is not what a person skilled in the art or an ordinary grocery consumer would know as "groceries that would normally fit into the container". It is submitted that the added claim language is clear under the requirements of 35 USC 112, and clearly sets forth the invention. Such language has been added to the claims to clarify them and address the earlier indefiniteness rejection.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. Please charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 13-1175 of the undersigned.

Respectfully,

MALLINCKRODT & MALLINCKRODT



Robert R. Mallinckrodt
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,565
Customer No. 27469

November 3, 2003
Salt Lake City, UT

E:\General\My Documents\Patents\367 Scarborough\008-RCE 11-3-03.wpd